

REMARKS

The Office Action of March 17, 2008 was received and carefully reviewed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the currently pending rejections are requested for the reasons advanced in detail below. By this amendment, claims 1-3 and 13-15 are amended to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-6 and 13-18 are currently pending in the instant application.

On pages 2 to 6 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6, 13-15, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Shimada et al. (US 6,448,578), claims 4 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shimada et al. in view of Jung et al. (US 2003/0107039), and claims 5 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shimada et al. in view of Sasaki et al. (US 6,956,236). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1-3, as amended, each recite a semiconductor element including, in part, “a gate insulating film formed *in contact with* the gate electrode layer” wherein *the layer comprising titanium is wider than the gate electrode layer*, “ (emphasis added). Similarly, independent claims 13-15, as amended, each recite a liquid crystal display device including, in part, “a gate insulating film formed *in contact with* the gate electrode layer” wherein “*the layer comprising titanium is wider than the gate electrode layer*,” (emphasis added).

The Office Action alleges that the gate signal line lower layer 3a, gate signal line 3, and gate insulating film 11 of Shimada et al. are equivalent to Applicant’s claimed “layer comprising titanium formed over a substrate,” “gate electrode layer formed over the layer,” and “gate insulating film formed in contact with the gate electrode layer,” respectively. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As explicitly disclosed by Shimada et al., the gate signal line 3 includes a titanium gate signal line lower layer 3a, an aluminum gate signal line intermediate layer 3b, and a titanium nitride gate signal line upper layer 3c. However, Applicants respectfully assert that Shimada et al. is completely silent with regard to formation of the gate signal line 3 structure having varied widths for any of the lower/intermediate/upper layers 3a/3b/3c. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Shimada et al. fails to teach or suggest either a semiconductor element or liquid crystal display device having “a gate insulating film formed

in contact with the gate electrode layer” wherein “the layer comprising titanium is wider than the gate electrode layer,” as required by amended independent claims 1-3 and 13-15.

In addition, Applicants respectfully assert that Jung et al. and Sasaki et al., whether taken singly or combined, remedy the deficiencies of Shimada et al. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that both Jung et al. and Sasaki et al. are completely silent with regard to formation of a multiple layered gate electrode structure having different widths.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Jung et al. and Sasaki et al., whether taken singly or combined, cannot remedy the deficiencies of Shimada et al., and thus, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to any of claims 1-6 and 13-18.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully assert that Shimada et al., Jung et al., and Sasaki et al., whether taken singly or combined, fail to teach or suggest the combination of features recited by at least amended independent claims 1-3 and 15-18. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) in view of Shimada et al., Jung et al., and Sasaki et al. be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the prior art rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that all pending claims be indicated as allowable, and that the application be passed to issue.

If a conference would expedite prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,
NIXON PEABODY LLP

/David B. Hardy, Reg. No. 47,362/

David B. Hardy

Registration No. 47,362

Date: June 16, 2008

NIXON PEABODY LLP

Customer 22204

401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900

Washington D.C. 2004-2128

(202) 585-8000